



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,030	05/24/2001	Ali Tabatabai	SONY-50P3882.01.US.P	2901
7590 07/24/2008 WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor Tow North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113			EXAMINER SHANG, ANNAN Q	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/865,030

**Applicant(s)**

TABATABAI ET AL.

**Examiner**

ANNAN Q. SHANG

**Art Unit**

2623

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-25, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-25, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 11-25, 27 and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9 and 10, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Basso et al (6,751,623)** in view of **Huang et al (6,593,936)**, Claims 11-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of **Huang et al (6,593,936)** in view of **Basso et al (6,751,623)** and claims 4, 5, and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Basso et al (6,751,623)** in view of **Huang et al (6,593,936)** and further in view of **ISO/IEC MPEG 00/N3575 "ISO/IEC" (cited in previous office action)**, Applicant amends the claims, discusses the claimed invention and the prior arts of record and further argues that the prior arts of record do not teach the amended claim limitations (see page 9+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes applicant's arguments, however with respect to the 103(a) rejection, Basso discloses updating description information of MPEG-4 using VRML language in a tree-based structure (col.1, lines 53-67, col.3, lines 15-21 and col.4, line 57-col.5, line 4). Basso further teaches that, external links (URLs) are part of scene description data and the MPEG-4 data includes instructions or rules for dynamically updating specific nodes of the data tree structure stored locally and further teaches that new instructions or rules can be transmitted to control the structural organization to allow easy and programmable or modification of

structural organization to support multiple protocols. The new instructions or rules transmitted from the server to the client for changing structural reorganization of the various nodes of the tree and dynamically updates information of particular nodes of the tree (col.5, lines 10-51, col.25, line 53-col.26, line 32 and line 48-col.27, line 49). Basso further suggests that MPEG-7 and other descriptive language could be used within the scope of the invention, but silent to the client executes a command and performs updates using data description language (DDL). However, in the same field of endeavor, this deficiency is disclosed in Huang reference, which performs updates using DDL (col.7, lines 1-50, col.10, line 47-col.11, line 7, col.12, line 26-col.14, line 40 and col.14, line 5+), which meets all the claimed limitations.

With respect to the 103(a) rejection of Huang in view of Basso for claims 11-25, 27 and 28, Huang is silent as to updating specific nodes of the data structure, however, Basso teaches dynamically updating specific nodes of the locally store MPEG-4 data as discussed above. With respect to claims 4, 5, and 8, Basso as modified by Huang, fail to explicitly disclose where sending a command indicating the type of update includes instructions to delete a portion of the description, where the delete is accomplished by deriving by restriction. However, in an analogous art, ISO/IEC discloses where the delete is accomplished by deriving by restriction (Page 5, Section 5.2.2.4). Hence Applicant's amendments do not overcome the prior arts of record as discussed below in the office action. The amendment to the claims necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection discussed below. **This office action is made final.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Basso et al (6,751,623)** in view of **Huang et al (6,593,936)**.

As to Claim 1, **Basso** discloses in figures 1-4, a method for dynamically updating descriptions of audio-visual content information in a server/client system, the method comprising:

The sever sending to the client (figs.3-4) a command indicating a type of update to make to a particular node of a data structure residing at the client and describing an item of content, where the particular node contains information describing an attribute of the item of audio-visual content and where the particular node is one of a plurality of nodes of the structure, where the plurality of nodes are associated with one another to form structure, where the description is compliant with MPEG-4 standard and sending to the client meta-data, instructions or rules, etc., to update the various modes (col. 3, lines 13-29, col.4, line 57-col.5, line 51, col.25, line 53-col.26, line 32 and line 48-col.27, line 49).

Basso does not explicitly disclose where the description is compliant with the MPEG-7 standard and updating the description using Data Description Language (DDL)

In an analogous art, **Huang** discloses specifying the location of a node in the description to perform the update, wherein the description is compliant with the MPEG-7 standard (Col. 7, lines 1-21 and Col. 10, line 46- Col. 11, line 8).

Huang further teaches, updating the description using Data Description Language (DDL)(Col. 7, lines 22-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Basso with the teachings of Huang in order to facilitate compliancy with the MPEG-7 standard for the benefit of complying with a standard that provides standardization of multimedia content descriptions.

As to Claim 2, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Basso teaches, determining whether the update is authorized to be performed (col.7, lines 13-25).

As to Claim 3, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Huang teaches where the issuing a command indicating the type of update comprises: sending command to add to the description, where the add is accomplished by deriving an extension (Col. 6, lines 35-54).

As to Claim 6, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Basso teaches, wherein the updating said description comprises: altering the structure of the description (col. 4, line 57 - col. 5, line 4).

As to Claim 7, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Basso teaches, where the updating description comprises: altering a parameter at a node of the description (col. 1, lines 47-59 and col. 3, lines 13-29).

As to Claim 9, the claimed elements issuing a derive by extension command, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 3, and is likewise treated.

4. Claims 11-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of **Huang et al (6,593,936)** in view of **Basso et al (6,751,623)**.

Regarding Claim 11, **Huang** discloses in a system (figure 9) comprising a first computer system (900-figure 9) and a second computer system (940 - figure 9) coupled to the first computer system via a communication link (930 - figure 9) the second computer system having stored thereon a description of audio-visual content (col.7, lines 1-21), a method for dynamically updating the description, comprising:

the first computer system (930) sending a command to the second computer system (940) to perform a specified update of a structure of description, where the description resides on the second computer system and where the nodes of the structure comprise the descriptions of portions of the audio-visual content information, the second computer system updating the description using Data Definition Language (col. 6, lines 35-47, col. 7, lines 22-41 and Col.10, line 47- Col.11, line 7).

Huang fails to specifically disclose the first computer system retrieving and sending command to the second computer system to perform a specified update of at least one node of a structure of the description, where nodes of the structure comprise the descriptions of portion of the audio-visual content information and the first computer

system sending a location of a node in the description for the update to the second computer system.

In an analogous art, Basso discloses the first computer system (150, fig.3) instructing the second computer system (190) to perform a specified update of at least one node of a structure of the description, where nodes of the structure comprise the descriptions of portion of the audio-visual content information, where the first computer system sends a location of a node in the description for the update to the second computer system (col. 3, lines 13-29, col.4, line 57-col.5, line 51, col.25, line 53-col.26, line 32 and line 48-col.27, line 49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang with the teachings of Basso in order to facilitate a first computer system instructing a second computer system to perform a specified update of at least one node of a structure of the description for the benefit of flexible formats of multimedia to allow quick adaptation of the audio-visual information.

As to Claim 12, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Basso teaches, the first computer determining whether the update is authorized to be performed (Col. 7, lines 13-25).

As to Claim 13, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Basso teaches, the second computer system determining whether the first computer system is authorized to instruct the update (Col. 7, lines 13-25).

As to Claim 14, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Huang teaches, the first computer system (900-figure 9) instructing the second



computer system (930-figure 9) to perform a specified update to the description comprises: issuing a command to add to the description (Col. 6, lines 35-54).

As to Claim 15, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Basso teaches, where the first computer system (150 - figure 3) instructing the second computer system (190 - figure 3) to perform a specified update to said description comprises issuing a command to delete a portion of said description by disclosing description information can be extracted from the elementary stream of a file (Col. 1, lines 47-59 and Col. 3, lines 13-29).

As to Claim 16, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Huang teaches, the first computer system (900 - figure 9) instructing said second computer system (930 - figure 9) to perform a specified update to said description comprises: issuing a command to change a portion of said description (Col. 6, lines 35-54).

As to Claim 17, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Basso teaches, where the second computer system (190-figure 3) updating the description comprises: altering a schema of said description, wherein said description comprises a tree structure and the update modifies the tree-structure (Co. 4, line 57 Col. 5, line 4).

As to Claim 18, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular "Basso teaches, where the second computer system (190 -figure 3) updating the description comprises: altering instance information, wherein said description comprises

a tree structure and the update modifies a parameter at a node of the tree-structure (Col. 1, lines 47-59 and Col. 3, lines 13-29).

As to Claim 19, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Basso teaches, selecting among a set data stored on said first computer to update the description on the second computer by disclosing information for editing the description of the A/V file can come from a different terminal and allow easy editing and manipulation (Col. 3, lines 13-29).

As to Claim 20, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Basso teaches, where the first and the second computer systems form a peer-to-peer system by disclosing first computer system (150 - figure 3) and second computer system (190 - figure 3) can utilize the Internet for transmission of A/V information (Col. 1, lines 32-36).

As to Claim 21, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Huang teaches, where the first computer system (900-figure 9) instructing the second computer system (940 - figure 9) to perform a specified update to the description comprises: receiving a request from the second computer for information, wherein a pull operation is initiated (Col. 5, lines 29-49).

As for Claim 22, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Huang teaches, where the first computer system (900 - figure 9) instructing the second computer system (940-figure 9) to perform a specified update to the description comprises: determining that the description stored on said second computer should be updated, wherein a push operation is initiated (Col. 5, lines 29-49).

As to Claim 23, the claimed "A computer readable medium residing on a first computer system having instructions stored thereon..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 11.

As for Claim 24, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Huang discloses, where the command structure further specifies a command selected from the group consisting of add, delete, and change commands (Col. 6, lines 35-47).

As for Claim 25, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Huang discloses, where the location further specifies between a relative address in the description and an absolute address in the description by disclosing the location in the scene description defines a spatial-temporal location (Col. 10, line 47 - Col. 11, line 7).

As for Claim 27, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Basso discloses, wherein said instructions further comprise a structure for specifying a security level to determine whether said update is allowed (Col. 7, lines 13-25).

As for Claim 28, the combination of Huang and Basso disclose, in particular Huang discloses, where the instructions are compliant with the Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Col. 7, lines 22-67).

5. Claims 4, 5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Basso et al (6,751,623)** in view of **Huang et al (6,593,936)** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **ISO/IEC MPEG 00/N3575 "ISO/IEC" (cited in previous office action)**.

As for Claim 4, the combination of Basso and Huang fail to explicitly disclose where the issuing a command indicating the type of update comprises: issuing a command to delete a portion of the description, wherein the delete is accomplished by deriving by restriction.

In an analogous art, ISO/IEC discloses where the delete is accomplished by deriving by restriction (Page 5, Section 5.2.2.4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Basso and Huang with the teaching of ISO/IEC in order to facilitate a delete action by deriving by restriction for the benefit of complying with an established standard.

As for Claim 5, the combination of Basso and Huang disclose, in particular Huang teaches creating of new descriptors can be accomplished using extensions and modifications can be made as well (Col. 6, lines 35-47). However, Huang fails to explicitly state using a restriction in order to modify a descriptor.

In an analogous art, the ISO/IEC discloses that the, "derive by restriction" command can be used to create new descriptors by using the base definition of the MPEG-7 scene description information (Page 5, section 5.2.2.4). Further, it would be obvious that in order to change a portion of the description, a restriction command would be required first, followed by an extension command in order to modify the node.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Basso and Huang with the teachings of ISO/IEC

in order to issue a command to change a portion of said description for the benefit of complying with an established standard.

Considering Claim 8, the claimed elements of where the issuing a command indicating the type of update comprises: issuing a derive by restriction command, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 4, and is likewise treated.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**. If you would like assistance from a **USPTO Customer Service Representative** or access to the automated information system, call **800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000**.

/Annan Q Shang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

**Annan Q. Shang**